



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

States Senate had called for a vote upon the question whether or not the members of the Senate would agree to establish an international organization to be made up of members, the majority of whom would be citizens of countries foreign to the United States, and to give to such a group of foreigners the power to attack by force of arms the United States, and that with the consent of the United States, the nature of the vote might have been forecasted with a measure of certainty. On that issue practically every American would have voted "No."

When confronted with the prospect of a high court of nations with the power to hear and determine specified cases of a legal nature; when faced with a situation where a State can summon another State to appear to litigate a judicial question, the States, large and small, obliging themselves thus to submit such cases, granting to the court unlimited power to decide such questions according to the rules of right; thus faced, the distinguished representatives of the great powers, self-styled friends of international peace, have balked. We may call some of these gentlemen by name, for their words have been printed. There is Sir Robert Cecil, of Great Britain; M. Léon Bourgeois, of France; Mr. Adatci, of Japan; Mr. Ricci-Busatti, of Italy. These gentlemen obeyed orders from home. The dominating governments of the world have made no advance over 1907. They are for a court so long as they are not obliged to submit cases to it. These gentlemen have served notice to this effect upon the rest of the world. The "Big Powers" still reserve the right to decide what of their cases shall be submitted to a court of justice for decision. They have said in substance, "Such a court, operating in such a way, backed up by public opinion, might decide against us. That is too serious a matter. We are opposed to a court with such jurisdiction." Thus here we have the whole fallacy of the so-called League of Nations in a nutshell. The test of sincerity in all attempts to set up a workable society of nations consists in the acceptance of international law based upon the inherent rights and duties of sovereign States. Nations sincerely interested in a genuine peace would never have proposed, in the first place, the league to enforce peace provided for in the Paris Treaty. Rather, they would have fixed their attention from the outset upon those well-known and established methods of establishing justice according to the rules of law. They would have concentrated upon the creation of an international tribunal to which any responsible State might appeal for the redress of alleged wrongs. David Jayne Hill is right; the overthrow of the war system depends primarily upon the creation for States of a means of redress without resort to arms. The men who proposed the impossible scheme of an alliance of the strong for the coercion of the weak by

force of arms were insincere, or ignorant, or both. The men who have opposed an international court of justice backed by the power of right may be sincere; they certainly think they are "taking care of number 1." The folly of it all, the tragedy! for their action casts a sinister hue over the whole proceedings at Geneva.

RATIFYING AN EXPURGATED TREATY

SENATOR KING, of Utah, introduced in the Senate, January 5, Senate Resolution 419, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The resolution reads:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the treaty concluded at Versailles on the 28th day of June, 1919, be ratified, excepting the articles 1 to 26, inclusive, constituting Part I, and articles 387 to 427, inclusive, constituting Part XIII of said treaty, and that the aforesaid exceptions be expressly included in the act of ratification."

It is difficult to see how this resolution can be made effective. Let us recall the relevant facts. It is true that the Congress of the United States declared, April 6, 1917, that a state of war existed between the United States and Germany. It is true that certain articles of armistice were entered into under date of November 11, 1918. Articles of peace were signed at Versailles June 28, 1919. Germany signed and ratified those articles of peace and is therefore bound to observe the terms of that treaty, including those portions which inure to the benefit of the government of the people of the United States. The United States, however, not having ratified the treaty, cannot obtain the benefits provided for in the treaty. Complicating the situation still more is the fact that Part I of the treaty, which was signed by Germany, has resulted in a League of Nations to which Germany is not a party. It is true that certain States, maintaining their neutrality between the United States and Germany during the war, are now members of the League of Nations without becoming otherwise parties to the Treaty of Versailles. If we were to grant that it is not necessary for the United States to accede to the Covenant of the League of Nations, in order to establish a legal peace between the United States and Germany, there remains the fact that throughout various parts of the Treaty of Versailles we find the League of Nations indispensable to the carrying out of many of the treaty's provisions. It is not possible for the Senate and the Executive to agree upon revisions or amendments to the articles constituting the League of Nations. The only way that the League of Nations can be revised is upon the initiative of the League of Nations itself. Whether the League of Nations will change itself sufficiently to be acceptable to the United States remains to be seen.

For the United States to ratify the treaty without ratifying the League of Nations would, it seems to us, bring us willy nilly into vital relations with such questions as mandates in Africa, Asia, and on the seven seas; with the government of the Saar Basin, the control of the free city of Danzig and of Polish communications. We would necessarily be concerned with such matters as the supervision of the international waterways of Europe and with various other matters inextricably interwoven with the treaty and the Covenant of the League.

DISARMAMENT

ENTIRELY commendable and most encouraging have been the recent efforts of statesmen, of economists, military leaders, and journalists of this country and of nations abroad to concentrate public thought upon "disarmament" as a practical method of reducing the fiscal burdens of men, burdens now so intolerable because so crushing. Seldom has journalism shown its highest range of possible social service as convincingly as the *New York World* has done with its gathering of world opinion favorable to immediate concerted governmental action reducing military costs. Credit also is due to Senators Borah and Walsh for projecting the issue into congressional debate, and thus forcing public consideration of the facts and inducing a reaction on the part of the people that will give the lawmakers some notion as to what the American people really want to have done.

The differences of opinion that have been disclosed, either in newspaper interviews or the debates, seldom have to do with the principle involved. There is practical agreement that there should be diminished armament with reduced taxation. Only when the question emerges as to whether the process shall be universal in range or limited, or whether it shall include land as well as naval forces, or whether it shall be a summary or a gradual act, do nations or publicists disagree. Moreover, in all their minds there is lurking beneath the surface expression of their thoughts, the dread of a social transformation after the Russian model. This unconsciously shapes their decisions as to reduction of military forces. Moscow, they have found out, does not play the game of war according to rules. Her word is mistrusted. The statesmen of Europe dare not be as idealistic as they otherwise might be nor as economical as they should be, because they now are carrying on international affairs faced by a power with a social structure and social program that are hostile to what western Europe has conceived to be essential to civilization. For them Russia is the ponderous obstacle to reduced armies and navies.

The situation in the United States is not quite as complex or ominous, and if Europe only had to be con-

sidered the disarmament "drive" would have more force. But Asia has arrived. The Pacific Ocean henceforth is to be the scene of our most acute national rivalry. The willingness or unwillingness of the United States to reduce its fleet, curb its present building program, and come to an agreement with Great Britain and Japan as to their respective national naval forces in the Pacific region, all hinges on retention of a spirit of good will between Japan and the United States, following whatever decision may be made as to rights of the Japanese as immigrants and as landholders.

We are not in favor of special compacts, partial in their range, dealing with this important phase of the peace movement. The process should be general in scope and inclusive in its range. It must be so devised as to avoid making the already strong nations stronger and the already weak less able to resist aggression. It should be a gradual and not a summary process, and take into account some present commitments that cannot in honor be ignored.

Most important of all, the "drive" needs conscience as well as commercialism back of it. Reduction of tax burdens, setting free for constructive purposes vast sums now paid for military upkeep, and return to creative industry of millions of men—these are all desirable. But a higher motive for disarmament is needed than these imply, if the fight for peace is to be won ultimately. There must be widely diffused love of right rather than might, of reliance on an international court rather than on an international army, and steady hatred of combat, especially the kind that modern applied science now makes possible.

OVERSEAS CARRYING BUSINESS

THE OVERSEAS carrying industry of the world has had its center now here, now there. Within modern history, once it was in Spain, once in Holland, once in the United States, once in Britain, and now it looks as if it were to be again in the United States. None of human endeavors is more filled with romance and significance than this transportation of the world's goods, particularly across the seas.

One wonders what bearings the rapid development of American ship-building is to have upon future international relations. During the year just ended, the output of the American shipyards has been 1,783 vessels of 2,860,725 gross tons. In 1918 our output was 821 vessels, 460 of which were steel, 361 of which were wood, all sea-going vessels. In 1919 our total output of sea-going vessels was 1,135 vessels, 802 of steel and 333 of wood. In 1920 our output of such vessels was 507 of steel, 121 of wood, while the total number of our non-